

### REMARKS

In the December 19, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-18 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the December 19, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to clarify them. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the examination of this application. Further, Applicants have added claims 19 and 20. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending, with claims 1, 7, and 13 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 7, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Itagi et al. (JP 11-184590). In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 7, 13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tada (JP 08-262932). In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to clarify them.

Specifically, claims 1, 7, and 13 now recite that a display unit having an image display portion or function that displays an image of an image forming device in which the plurality of the paper supply units or paper discharge units are visually distinguished from each other, and a second portion that simultaneously shows at least an abnormality for each of the corresponding paper supply unit and a notification not being an abnormality. Further, the display unit or function also restricts operation of the paper supply unit selection when at least one abnormality has been detected.

Applicants respectfully assert that Itagi et al. and Tada each disclose a display unit that displays *only* an image of an image forming device in which the plurality of the paper

supply units or paper discharge units are visually distinguished from each other. In contrast, the independent claims of the present application recite that the display unit simultaneously shows at least an abnormality for each of the corresponding paper supply units and a notification not being an abnormality. Also, Applicants respectfully assert that the display unit of Itagi et al. fails to restrict operation of the paper supply unit selection when at least one abnormality has been detected.

Applicants respectfully assert that the recited structure is not disclosed or suggested by Itagi et al., Tada, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 13 as now amended, are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 15 and 16 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 7 and 13 and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claims 7 and 13, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In item 5 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada (JP 08-262932) in view of Itagi et al., and claims 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itagi et al. in view of Higuchi (US 6,259,468). In item 6 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itagi et al. in view of Badovinac et al. (US 2004-0228639). In item 7 of the Office Action, claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Tada in view of Itagi et al., and further in view of Badovinac et al. In item 8 of the Office Action, claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada in view of Badovinac et al. In item 9 of the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed prior art in view of Itagi et al. In item 10 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itagi et al. in view of Hosaka et al. (JP 56-154751). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 as mentioned above.

More specifically, claims 1, 7, and 13 now recite a display unit having an image display portion or function that displays an image of an image forming device in which the plurality of the paper supply units or paper discharge units are visually distinguished from each other, and a second portion that simultaneously shows at least an abnormality for each of the corresponding paper supply unit and a notification not being an abnormality. Further, the display unit or function also restricts operation of the paper supply unit selection when at least one abnormality has been detected.

Applicants believe that Itagi et al. and Tada fail to disclose or to suggest these features for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully assert that Higuchi is cited to show an out of paper display, but fails to overcome the deficiencies of Itagi et al. Applicants respectfully assert that Badovinac et al. are cited to show an audible alarm, but fail to overcome the deficiencies of Itagi et al. and Tada. Applicants respectfully assert that Hosaka et al. are cited to show that abnormalities consisting of paper jams and improperly mounted cassettes, but fail to overcome the deficiencies of Itagi et al. Applicants respectfully assert the Admitted Prior Art is cited to show a default paper supply determining unit, but fails to overcome the deficiencies of Itagi et al. and Tada.

Applicants respectfully assert that the recited arrangement is not disclosed or suggested by Tada, Itagi et al., Higuchi, Badovinac et al., Applicant's disclosed prior art, Hosaka, or any prior art of record, alone or in combination.

It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of a display unit.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 17, and 18 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, and 13, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

***New Claims 19 and 20***

Applicants have added new claims 19 and 20, which depend on independent claims 1 and 7. Applicants believe that these claims are allowable for the aforementioned reasons claims 1 and 7 are allowable. Further, Applicants believe that these claims are further allowable because they contain additional limitations.

Examination and consideration are respectfully requested.

\* \* \*

Appl. No. 10/707,105  
Amendment dated March 19, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of December 19, 2007

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd M. Guise/  
Todd M. Guise  
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: March 19, 2008

S:\02-FEB08-YS\KM-US030558 Amendment II.doc